

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are pending in the application.

Restriction Requirement

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372, as the Examiner asserts that these claims lack unity of invention because they do not share a special technical feature and they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1. The Action asserts that Applicants are required to elect a single invention to which the claims will be restricted.

The Examiner has categorized the claims as follows:

- I. Claims 1, 2 and 7, drawn to a product.
- II. Claims 3 and 4, drawn to a process of making.
- III. Claims 5 and 8, drawn to a process of using.
- IV. Claim 6, drawn to a product.

Election

In response to the requirement for restriction, Applicants elect Group I (claims 1, 2, and 7, drawn to a product), with traverse. Applicants note that claims 1-8 encompass the elected invention.

Traverse

Notwithstanding the election of Group I in response to the Restriction Requirement, Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's requirement for restriction.

Applicants respectfully disagree that the present invention should be subject to restriction, and respectfully points out that the claims of Group I, drawn to a product, should be considered with the claims drawn to a process of making, the claims drawn to a process of using, and the

product of claim 6, i.e., the claims of Groups II-IV. Applicants note that this is an application filed under 35 U.S.C. § 371, and thus, unity of invention rules apply.

Applicants note that unity of invention shall be fulfilled only when there is a technical relationship among those inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features.

Applicant further notes that the technical features of Group I, namely the special technical feature of the claimed anisotropic conductive adhesive sheet, are included in each of the other Groups II-IV. Since the technical features of Group I are common, Applicants submit the restriction requirement is inappropriate. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider this aspect of the PCT Rules in reconsidering the present restriction requirement.

The standard, as described clearly in M.P.E.P. §§ 1850 and 1893.03(d), is not whether one group of claims has a feature which is not in another group, but whether the groups have a common technical relationship, i.e., whether a special technical feature is common to the groups (*e.g.*, the pressure wave generator and features thereof). If each of the groups has one or more common special technical features or relationships, then they cannot be restricted (*e.g.*, the pressure wave generator and features thereof).


In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner examine the claims of Group I, drawn to a product and Group III, drawn to a process of use of the product.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons discussed above, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner's requirement for restriction be withdrawn. Withdrawal of the requirement for the restriction with the examination of all claims pending in this application is respectfully requested. Favorable consideration with early allowance of the pending claims is most earnestly requested.

If the Examiner has any questions, or wishes to discuss this matter, please call the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,
Akira OTANI et al.


Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027 42,920

March 24, 2009
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191